2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

On February 1, 2017, Plaintiff filed this action against Defendant, seeking a declaration that the deed of trust which was secured against the Property was not extinguished and related reliefs. ECF No. 1 at 15:26-17:13.

Prior to the commencement of the action, the parties have been discussing potential resolutions of this matter. As a result, the Parties stipulated to multiple extensions for Defendant to respond to Plaintiff's Complaint. See ECF No. 12, 14, and 16. At this time, the Parties have reached a mutually agreeable settlement framework whereby the Property will be placed for sale to interested third parties, with the proceeds to be paid to Plaintiff and Defendant. The framework is contingent on the sale of the Property, which necessarily requires a short period of time for marketing and sale. The Parties anticipate it may be another six (6) months for the Property to be marketed and sold, and for the Parties to finalize the settlement following the sale. In the interest of judicial economy, the Parties jointly request for a brief stay of this action in its entirety for six (6) months to effectuate the tentative settlement framework.

II. LEGAL STANDARD AND ARGUEMNTS

"District courts have inherent authority to stay proceedings before them." Rohan ex rel. Gates v. Woodford, 334 F.3d 803, 817 (9th Cir. 2003). To evaluate the parties' request to stay, this Court may consider "any potential prejudice to the non-moving party, hardship or inequity to the moving party if the proceedings are not stayed, and the interests of judicial economy and efficiency." Mangani v. Merck & Co., No. 2:06-cv-00914, 2006 WL 2707459 at *1 (D. Nev.); Rivers v. Walt Disney Co., 980 F. Supp. 1358, 1360 (C.D. Calif. 1997) (considering the same three factors when evaluating a motion to stay). This Court may properly stay an action pending finalizing of tentative settlement among parties. Arias v. Prospect Mortgage, LLC, 2:13-cv-00671-PMP-GWF (D. Nev. May 1, 2014).

Plaintiff and Defendant jointly request for a stay of six (6) months to effectuate a tentative settlement that involves sale of the Property. There are two parties in this action, Plaintiff Wilmington Trust and Defendant Park Bonanza, who are jointly moving this Court for a stay of this litigation to effectuate a tentative settlement framework. Therefore, no parties in this action will suffer any prejudice as a result of the stay. Denying the stay, however, will cause

Ш

rced to enter into discovery and other case	
management activities. Plaintiff and Defendant anticipate that the sale of the Property will	
settlement. Therefore, the brief stay may	
ce from the Court. In the unlikely event that the	
romptly move to lift the stay and continue	
y is not requested for purposes of delay or bad	
nses of litigation costs and judicial resources.	
est that the Court enter an Order directing that:	
hs, until February 8, 2018 and	
2018 either:	
ing this case or	
ss of settlement or motion to lift the stay, as	
DATED: August 11, 2017	
GORDON REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LLP	
/s/ Wing Yan Wong Robert S. Larsen, Esq. (SBN 7785) Wing Yan Wong, Esq. (SBN 13622) 300 S. Fourth Street, Suite 1550 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101	
Attorneys for Park Bonanza East Townhouse Owners Association, Inc.	
S SO ORDERED:	
Heorge Holey J. NITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
ATED: <u>8/14/2017</u>	